

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 MATCONUSA LP,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 HOUSTON CASUALTY
14 COMPANY,

15 Defendant.

CASE NO. C19-1952JLR

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
REGARDING SUBJECT
MATTER JURISDICTION

16 The court has reviewed Plaintiff MatconUSA LP's ("Matcon") complaint (Compl.
17 Dkt. # 1)) and finds that it does not establish subject matter jurisdiction over this action.
18 Accordingly, the court ORDERS Matcon to show cause within seven (7) days why the
19 court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action.

20 Matcon invokes the court's diversity jurisdiction. (Compl. ¶ 3.) A federal court's
21 diversity jurisdiction extends to "all civil actions where the matter in controversy
22 exceeds . . . \$75,000 . . . and is between . . . citizens of different States." 28 U.S.C.

1 § 1332(a)(1). “In cases where entities rather than individuals are litigants, diversity
2 jurisdiction depends on the form of the entity.” *Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage,*
3 *LP*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006). Here, because Matcon is a limited partnership and
4 Defendant Houston Casualty Company is a corporation (*see* Compl. ¶¶ 1-2), the court
5 must make jurisdictional determinations specific to those entities, *Johnson*, 437 F.3d at
6 899. “For purposes of diversity jurisdiction, a limited partnership is a citizen of all of the
7 states of which its partners are citizens.” *Id.* For purposes of diversity jurisdiction, a
8 corporation is a citizen of both its state of incorporation and the state where it has its
9 principal place of business. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1). Thus, to establish subject matter
10 jurisdiction, Matcon must establish that none of its partners are citizens of Texas—the
11 state in which Defendant Houston Casualty Company is incorporated and has its principal
12 place of business. (*See* Compl. ¶ 2.)

13 This has not happened here. The court has no information either establishing or
14 alleging the citizenship of Matcon’s partners. Accordingly, the court ORDERS Matcon
15 to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter
16 jurisdiction. If Matcon fails to provide the court with the information described above

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

1 within seven (7) days of the date of this order, this case will be dismissed without
2 prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

3 Dated this 29th day of January, 2020.

4
5 

6 JAMES L. ROBART
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22